

## REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **February 17, 2005** the examiner reviewed claims 1-21. Claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-11, 15, and 17-18 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Glass, Randal W. (USPub 2002/0056043, hereinafter "Glass").

### Objections to the claims

Claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-11, 15, and 17-18 were objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 3-4, 8, 10-11, 15, and 17-18 to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 were rejected as being anticipated by Glass. Applicant respectfully points out that Glass teaches **transmitting biometric data** over a network for authentication against stored biometric data (see Glass Abstract).

In contrast, the present invention **reads biometric data from an identification credential** presented by a user and compares this biometric data locally with a current biometric sample (see page 7, lines 1-20 and page 3, lines 9-11 of the instant application). This is advantageous because it allows the system to operate independently of a network, thereby reducing the need for fixed assets and communications links. There is nothing within Glass, either explicit or implicit, which suggests reading biometric data from an identification credential presented by a user and comparing this biometric data locally with a current biometric sample.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to clarify that the present invention reads biometric data from an identification credential presented by a user and compares this biometric data locally with a current biometric sample. These amendments find support on page 7, lines 1-20 and on page 3, lines 9-11 of the instant application.


Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 9-14, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 16-21, which depend upon claim 15, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.



### CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Edward J. Grundler  
Registration No. 47,615

Date: April 21, 2005

Edward J. Grundler  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
2820 Fifth Street  
Davis, CA 95616-7759  
Tel: (530) 759-1663  
FAX: (530) 759-1665